DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 181 IR 010 352

AUTHOR Way, Flo
TITLE Evaluation Supplement to the Brochure Prepared for ED/fair '72 on the DOVACK System.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 18p.; For related document, see ED 071 268.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Instruction; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; Language Experience Approach; *Program Evaluation; Reading Ability; Reading Achievement; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading; Vocabulary Development; Vocabulary Skills
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III

ABSTRACT

This revised evaluation supplement to the "DOVACK Method for Teaching Reading Project Report" corrects errors in the report's original evaluation supplement with respect to the results of the 72-day and 108-day DOVACK Random Sample Vocabulary Recognition Tests employed to measure the effectiveness of DOVACK as a language experience instructional system, contains an updated description of the DOVACK system which indicates the improvements made possible through better computer support, and includes an expanded list of references on the development and application of the DOVACK system. (Author/JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED221181

Evaluation Supplement
to the
Brochure Prepared for ED/fair '72
on
The DOVACK System
by
Flo Way

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Florine L. Way

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR010352

Contents

Item	Page
Acknowledgments	3
Introduction	4
(1) Soft data from subjective judgment, observation, photographs, and film	4 - 5
(2) Hard data from standardized tests	5 - 9
Intermediate grades	6 - 7
First Grade	7 - 9
(3) Hard data on each pupil's Rate of Learning to recognize his own vocabulary	9 - 12
(4) Data on estimated readability levels of dictations	12
(5) Hard data on Vocabulary Usage	13
Conclusions	13 - 14
The DOVACK System	15
DOVACK References	16 - 17

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

Acknowledgments

Flo Way originated, designed, and developed The DOVACK System while she was conducting an experimental class for adult illiterates at the Federal Correctional Institution in Tallahassee, Florida.

The Research Council of Florida State University funded the evaluation pilot study which preceeded and led to the development of DOVACK.

Dr. E. P. Miles, Jr. coordinated development of computer support capabilities while he was Director of the Computing Center at Florida State University.

Mr. William Fuller and Mr. William Petty are the scientific programmers for DOVACK.

Dr. Duane A. Meeter is the consultant in statistics for DOVACK.

The U. S. Office of Education, ESEA Title III, funded the field tests of DOVACK in Monticello, Florida, 1968-69 - 1970-71 (OEG-4-8-060040-0069-056).

The Jefferson County (Florida) School Board, Mr. Desmond M. Bishop, Superintendent, administered the USOE grant for the field tests.

The U. S. Office of Education financed the printing of the brochure for distribution from the DOVACK exhibit at ED/fair '72 which is sponsored by the USOE. ESEA Title III financed the reproduction of the Evaluation Supplement.

Flo Way
DOVACK
P. O. Box 3140
Manchester, NH 03105

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way {3}

The purpose of the project in Monticello was to field-test and perfect The DOVACK System for use on a large scale for teaching initial and remedial reading. By definition and by design, the field-testing of an original system precludes the collection of uncontaminated hard data for a conventional research design. Instead, there must be continuous process evaluation and there must be modifications indicated by that continuous process evaluation.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of The DOVACK System in achieving the educational objectives stated for it was in five areas: (1) Soft data from subjective judgment, observation, photographs and film. (2) Hard data from standardized tests, although some of the these were considered inappropriate. (3) Hard data from each pupil's Rate of Learning his own new words as demonstrated by his performance on the DOVACK Random Sample Vocabulary Recognition (DRSVR) Tests. (4) Data on readability levels of dictations. (5) Hard data on Vocabulary Usage.

All of these are discussed in detail along with basic assumptions, tables and figures, and references to the literature, in the full evaluation report that is being prepared.

This writer has extracted some of the representative data to present in this paper as a supplement to the DOVACK brochure that was prepared for ED/fair '72. (Tables, figures, references to the literature, and extended discussion are omitted here.)

(1) Soft data from subjective judgment, observation, photographs and film

Subjective evaluations by teachers, aides, pupils, parents, and visiting educators are overwhelmingly favorable to DOVACK. Comments in the Visitors Register written by visiting educators are available for inspection. The American Institutes for Research (Air) selected DOVACK as one of 34 Model Programs in Childhood Education and as one of 17 Model Programs in Reading. AIR also selected DOVACK for inclusion in an audiovisual presentation of model programs at the 1970 White House Conference on Children. Professional evaluators for ESEA Title III programs have given DOVACK Excellent ratings. Visiting authors have written and published favorable accounts of DOVACK.

Prior to the funding in Monticello, the subjective judgment of illiterate prison inmate pupils was overwhelmingly favorable. In fact, this writer originated, designed, and developed DOVACK during an experimental class in a federal prison (following a successful evaluation pilot study there of her Individual Pupil Dictation Technique) when the illiterate prison inmate pupils insisted that she "get this way of teaching reading so everybody that needs it can use it.

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

Filmed evidence of the pupils achieving the objectives stated for them is contained in the film, "The DOVACK System," (b&w 16 mm 18 min) which can be ordered from: Area AV Center, Box 499, Monticello, Florida, 32344.

Photographs of pupils achieving the objectives stated for them are contained in published literature (see DOVACK References); and are also available for inspection at the DOVACK booth.

(2) Hard data from standardized tests

Standardized tests selected by the county and administered in the county-wide testing program were used for the analysis: California Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Level 2, 1968, for the intermediate grades; California Achievement Tests (CAT), Lower Primary, 1963, for the first grade.

All tests in the batteries were analyzed because The DOVACK System is a unified approach to teaching, not just a way of teaching reading - important as that is. (For example, it is necessary for the pupils to learn many math concepts and skills in order to manipulate the equipment and materials for their independent study.)

Results of the standardized tests, especially on the intermediate level, are of questionable validity and reliability because (a) the same tests were administered to all pupils in a grade regardless of the fact that many pupils were performing from one to four or five years below the level of their grade; (b) the population of the county is atypical; (c) the reading sections of the tests, it is generally conceded, are geared to the basal-reader type of teaching which means that pupils taught by a language experience approach must "run twice as fast to go half as far." For these reasons, it would be unwise to infer any general conclusions from these data.

Class sizes varied. The number for whom data were available in the intermediate grades varied from eight in Grade 4 to 29 in Grade 7. The number of pupils in each of the seven first grade classes (both DOVACK and Control) for whom data were available ranged from 19 in one class to 27 in another.

All standardized test scores were expressed as Grade Equivalents.

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

Intermediate Grades

Analyses of Variance were performed on the results of the CTBS in the intermediate grades to test the significance of differences between the DOVACK groups and the Control groups on the pretest-posttest increment for each test; between the DOVACK groups and the Residue; and between the Control groups and the Residue. (Note: The Residue is comprised of all pupils in each grade who were not randomly assigned from matched pairs to the DOVACK and Control groups.)

Grade 4

In Grade 4, 1969-1970: The pretest-posttest increment for the DOVACK group was higher than the pretest-posttest increment for the Control group at a statistically significant level in Spelling (.025), in Arithmetic Total (.025). and in Battery Total (.025). It might be argued that these gains were due to a regression effect since the DOVACK and Control groups were chosen on the basis of low scores and low performance. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the DOVACK and Control groups on pretest scores. This lack of statistically significant differences between the pretest scores tends to indicate a real gain for the DOVACK group rather than a regression effect.

Grades 5, 6, and 7

From eleven summary tables for pupils in grades 5, 6, and 7, on all tests on CTBS, there were very few statistically significant differences between the DOVACK groups and the Control groups or between the DOVACK groups and the Residue or between the Control groups and the Residue. The exceptions are noted below.

In Grade 5, 1968-1969: The increment for the Control group was higher than the increment for the DOVACK group in Spelling at the .05 level of statistical significance. In the same grade, the Residue was higher than the DOVACK group on Spelling (.001) and on Language Total (.05). (Note: This proved to be excellent for process evaluation. Needless to say, this embarrassing revelation had a salutary effect; and the techniques for integrating Spelling with DOVACK were improved.)

In Grade 6, 1969-1970: The increment for the Control Group was higher than the increment for the DOVACK group in Language Total at the .025 level of statistical significance. (Note: This is traceable to the Language Mechanics Test.)

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

In Grade 7, 1968-1969: The increment for the DOVACK group was higher than the increment for the Control group on Arithmetic Applications at the .05 level of statistical significance. (Note: In all of the other intermediate grades - except in Grade 5, 1969-1970 - the increment on Arithmetic Applications for the DOVACK group was higher than the increment on Arithmetic Applications for the control group but not at a statistically significant level. This higher performance of the DOVACK groups over the Control groups in Arithmetic Applications as demonstrated on the standardized tests is not surprising because the reading material in Arithmetic Applications is probably a truer test of the ability to read critically, comprehend, profit from the DOVACK type of experience in attacking unfamiliar words, and profit from the DOVACK language experience type of teaching than is the reading material in the reading tests.)

In Grade 7, 1968-1969: The increment for the DOVACK group was higher than the increment for the Residue at a statistically significant level in Reading Comprehension (.05), in Arithmetic Applications (.05), in Reading Total (.01), and in Battery Total (.05). In the same class, the only statistically significant difference between the increment for the Control group and the increment for the Residue was in Language Expression in which the increment for the Control group was higher than the increment for the Residue at the .05 level of statistical significance. There were no statistically significant differences between the DOVACK groups and the Residue or between the Control groups and the Residue on the pretest scores.

First Grade

In Grade 1, 1970-1971, the school principal assigned all of the first grade pupils randomly by race and sex to seven classes, and then randomly assigned a teacher to each class. Fortunately, of the two teachers who are considered by a number of knowledgable people to be "the best," one was randomly assigned to a class that had DOVACK and the other to a class that became a Control class.

The pupils from four classes spent an average of about twenty-five minutes a day in the DOVACK classroom. The pupils from three classes had no DOVACK treatment and are called the Control classes.

No pretests were given. The CAT tests were administered in the spring by one team of teachers to all of the classes. The first grade tests are considered somewhat more valid and reliable than the intermediate tests for the following reasons. Although the first-grade population in Jefferson County is atypical, and although

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

standardized reading tests are generally considered to favor pupils who have been taught by a basal reader approach over those who have been taught by a language experience approach, the fact still remains that atypical populations of first-grade pupils have not yet had as much time to accumulate the standardized test score deficits that are characteristic of such populations by the time they reach the middle grades.

In an effort to identify relevant variables that might help with interpretation of the program and plan for future uses of DOVACK, and that might merit further investigation, this writer considered the first grade test results important enough to compile approximately a hundred and twenty tables and figures. These include, by class for each test, Analyses of Variance and Multiple Range Tests. They also include cumulative percent tables and figures by race and sex within each of the seven first-grade classes for each test. Obviously, it is impossible even to attempt to present a comprehensive summary of these results in this brief brochure supplement.

There were vast differences in results among the DOVACK classes and among the Control classes as well as between DOVACK and Control classes. The DOVACK teacher was the same for each class that had DOVACK but the classroom teachers had vastly different characteristics, years of experience, personalitites, and teaching styles. The national norm of the CAT test battery at the time 1.8.

In lieu of a comprehensive summary, this writer thought it might be of interest to extract the two highest mean scores from the seven classes on each of the CAT tests. Beside each score, a D or a C indicates whether the mean score was achieved by a DOVACK group or by a Control group. Unless indicated in parentheses, the difference between the two highest scores is not statistically significant. All of the scores in the first column were achieved by the <u>same</u> first grade class. The scores in the second and third columns were achieved by several different DOVACK and Control classes.

Reading Vocabulary:	1.9 D	1.8 D		
Reading Comprehension:	1.6 D	1.4 C		
Reading Total:	1.9 D	1.8 D		
Mechanics of English:	2.2 D	2.2 C		
Spelling:	3.4 D	2.1 C		(.05) D
Language Total:	2.6 D	2.1 D	2.1 C	(.05) D
Arithmetic Fundamentals:	2.1 D	1.9 D	1.9 C	
Arithmetic Reasoning:	1.9 D	1.7 C		
Arithmetic Total:	2.0 D	1.7 D	1.7 C	
Battery Total:	2.1 D	1.8 D	1.8 C	(.05) D

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way {8}

The mean score of 3.4 in Spelling for one of the DOVACK classes was higher at the .05 level of significance than the mean score in Spelling for each of the six other classes, both DOVACK and Control; including one DOVACK class which had the lowest mean score in Spelling.

The mean score of 2.6 in Language Total for one of the DOVACK classes was higher at the .05 level of statistical significance than the mean score in Language Total for each of the six other classes, both DOVACK and Control, including one DOVACK class which had the lowest mean score in Language Total.

It can be noted above that the class that achieved the highest mean scores on every test (except in Mechanics of English in which it tied with a Control class) was the same DOVACK class. The identical second highest score was achieved on four tests by both a DOVACK class and a Control class. On three tests, a Control class received the second highest mean score. The mean scores on three tests were different at a statistically significant level with the direction in favor of a DOVACK class on each test.

In the highest scoring first grade class, a DOVACK class, the only one of the mean scores that was below the national norm was in Reading Comprehension. This seems ironic except when one remembers that the standardized reading tests are generally considered to be based on the basal reader type of teaching reading and are presumably designed for a typical population. Even so, this highest score in Reading Comprehension was achieved by a DOVACK class.

It might be argued that the Hawthorne effect may have influenced the pupils in the DOVACK class that had the highest mean scores. If this is true, then why didn't the Hawthorne effect influence the pupils in all of the DOVACK classes? Inspection of the complete tables which are included in the full evaluation report reveals that some of the lowest mean scores were made by DOVACK classes as well as by Control classes. It may be tentatively concluded that there must be compatability of teacher and method.

Included in the full evaluation report, a table of selected characteristics of the teachers enables the reader to make subjective speculations about the possible effect of these variables that were not controlled statistically.

(3) Hard data on each pupil's Rate of Learning to recognize his own vocabulary

The DOVACK Random Sample Vocabulary Recognition (DRSVR) Tests are administered for the purpose of testing each pupil's ability to

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

recognize in isolation his own vocabulary on tests derived from the computer-stored word bank of all of the new words that he has dictated.

Every six days, each pupil was given a DRSVR Test. The mean score on these tests for each pupil and for each class was obtained for the year. Cumulative DRSVR Tests were also given to DOVACK pupils in grades 2, 4, 5, and 6, each on his own vocabulary, at 36 days, at 72 days, and at 108 days. Class means for grades 2, 4, 5, and 6 were obtained for each cumulative test.

The DRSVR Tests are computer-compiled and computer-printed for each pupil. They can be administered by each pupil to himself. These data are unique to DOVACK. They are the most important data collected during the project. The formula for the sampling technique to obtain the test words is designed to yield an unbiased estimate, with a stated precision, of the number of new words learned by each pupil per class period. (Dr. Duane A. Meeter, Consultant in Statistics, wrote the formula for the DRSVR Tests.) The DRSVR Tests and Reports are pupil-criterion-referenced. They are used for both process and product evaluation. Sixty-six tables and figures have been prepared to present the data in the full evaluation report that is being written.

For each of the DRSVR Tests (6-day, 36-day, 72-day, and 108-day), the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test was used to test the differences in performance due to sex. For each test, cumulative per cent tables and figures for each class were made to show the Rate of Learning per class period by race and sex.

It is obviously impossible, in this brochure supplement, to summarize all of the data. Results from two different grade levels will be extracted.

For the unbiased estimate of the number of words from his total list that each pupil would be expected to recognize in isolation if he were tested on the total list, the reader may multiply each reported number of words learned per class period by the number of class periods in the test period. (In this supplement, only the class means and the highest individual scores are reported.)

Grade 2

In Grade 2, 1969-1970, (13 black males, 10 black females), differences in performance due to sex were statistically significant at the .05 level on the mean of the 6-day DRSVR Tests and on the 108-day

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

DRSVR Test, with the direction in favor of the females on both tests. There was no statistically significant difference in performance due to sex on the 36-day DRSVR Test or on the 72-day DRSVR Test.

In Grade 2, 1969-1970: On the 6-day DRSVR Tests, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning new words per class period for the class was 4 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual mean Rate of Learning per class period was 9 (achieved by a black male). On the 36-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning per class period for the class was 3 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual Rate of Learning per class period was 7 (achieved by a black male). On the 72-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning per class period for the class was 3 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual Rate of Learning per class period was 7 (black male). On the 108-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 3 and the highest was 7 (black female). This means that on the 6-day DRSVR Tests, the unbiased estimate of the class mean of the total number of words learned during the test period was 24 and the unbiased estimate of the highest number of words learned by an individual during the test period was 54. On the 36-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the class mean of the total number of words learned during the test period was 108 and the unbiased estimate of the highest number of words learned by an individual was 252. On the 72-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 216 and the highest individual number was 504. On the 108-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 324 and the highest individual number was 756.

Grade 6

In Grade 6, 1969-1970, (19 black males, 8 black females), differences in performance due to sex were not statistically significant on any of the tests.

In Grade 6, 1969-1970: On the 6-day DRSVR Tests, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning new words per class period for the class was 8 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual mean Rate of Learning per class period was 14 (achieved by a black male and by a black female). On the 36-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning per class period for the class was 7 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual Rate of Learning per class period was 15 (achieved by a black male and by a black female). On the 72-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the mean Rate of Learning per class period for the class was 5 and the unbiased estimate of the highest individual Raate of Learning per class period was 10 (black female). On the 108-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 2 and the highest was 4 (black male). This means that on the 6-day

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

DRSVR Tests, the unbiased estimate of the class mean of the total number of words learned during the test period was 48 and the unbiased estimate of the highest number of words learned by an individual during the test period was 84. On the 36-day DRSVR Test, the unbiased estimate of the class mean of the total number of words learned during the test period was 252 and the unbiased estimate of the highest number of words learned by an individual was 540. On the 72-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 360 and the highest indivical number was 720. On the 108-day DRSVR Test, the class mean was 216 and the highest individual number was 432. It is interesting to note that this group of sixth grade pupils reached their peak performance on the 72-day DRSVR Test.

(4) Data on estimated readability levels of dictations

Fry's Formula was used to obtain estimates of the readability levels of the dictations. A mean readability level of third grade was found for the following grades: Grade 5 in 1968-1569; Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6 in 1969-1970; Grades 1 and 6 in 1970-1971. A mean readability level of fourth grade was found for Grade 6 in 1968-1969 and for Grade 5 in 1970-1971. A mean readability level of fifth grade was found for Grade 7 in 1968-1969.

One variable that possibly accounts for the differences in estimates of readability levels is the kind of population from which the data were derived. For example, the pupils in 1968-1969 were chosen for both DOVACK groups and Control groups on the basis of the ratio of difference between their reading scores and their IQ scores; the pupils in 1969-1970 were chosen on the basis of their low scores on a standardized reading test; the first grade classes in 1970-1971 were heterogeneously divided, randomly assigned by race and sex; the fifth and sixth grade pupils in 1970-1971 were chosen on the basis of low scores on a standardized reading test.

Another relevant variable, not supervised or controlled statistically, is the amount of time the teachers spent expanding the experiences of the students. It seems evident that some of the teachers need to spend more time with students on developing both real and vicarious experiences that will help the students extend their vocabularies and learn to express themselves orally in more challenging sentences. More extensive use of composite stories should also be useful in these efforts. (Note added, May 1982: DOVACK Composite stories are third person standard English paraphrases of the student dictations. Later use of them with DOVACK students not included in this report is proving to be even more beneficial than anticipated. They help the student learn standard English for alternative situational use; recognize his own vocabulary in another context; and make the transition to published materials. Also, a subjective observation is that they help raise the student's self-image.)

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

(5) Hard data on Vocabulary Usage

A data structure has been devised so that all of the words the pupils dictate can be tabulated by number of users, frequency of use, by grade, race, and sex. (This can be enlarged to include more demographic data by increasing the ID code.) When money is available, work will continue on collecting and analyzing these and additional vocabulary data to include in The Spoken Language of Diverse Populations, An Analytical Corpus.

Conclusions

Evaluation of the effectiveness of The DOVACK System in achieving the educational objectives stated for it were conducted in five areas. Two sets of conclusions are included in this supplement, extracted from the conclusions to be presented in the full evaluation report. The conclusions presented in this supplement are (A) Five areas of evaluation, and (B) Adoption of The DOVACK System.

(A) Five Areas of Evaluation

(1) The soft data from subjective judgment and observation of pupils, parents, aides, professional educators, and professional evaluators are overwhelmingly favorable to The DOVACK System. Written documents supporting these evaluations include comments in the Visitors Register; brochure, booklet, and listing by the American Institutes for Research when they selected DOVACK as both a Model Program in Childhood Education (1970) and a Model Program in Reading (1971); articles by visiting authors (see References); and written evaluations by professional evaluators for ESEA Title III. Film and photographic evidence are available.

(2) No definitive general conclusions can be inferred from the standardized test data because of the small sample sizes, the experimental field-testing situation, the atypicality of the populations, the inappropriateness of some of the standardized tests especially on the intermediate level; and the impossibility of controlling certain crucial variables.

However, it can be concluded that a population that is mainly rural, black, and disadvantaged, with dialectical and cultural differences, from a county that has been federally designated "poverty-level" need not necessarily be the population that scores below the national norm on standardized tests.

There is implied evidence that the way the DOVACK Composite Stories are used in The DOVACK System is effective in teaching standard English for alternative situational use and in helping to make the

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

transition from DOVACK to conventional reading materials.

(3) By their performance on the DOVACK Random Sample Vocabulary Recognition (DRSVR) Tests, pupils proved that they can learn to recognize in isolation words that they have dictated in context.

There is implied evidence that the DOVACK Way of teaching skills for word attack and word recognition is effective.

Performance in learning to recognize words is not necessarily due to sex when the words were dictated in context by the pupils themselves.

The DOVACK System can be used effectively in teaching first grade pupils who are grouped heterogeneously.

(4) The readability level of instructional materials for a first-grade population that is mainly rural, black, and disadvantaged, with dialectical and cultural differences, from a county that has been federally designated "poverty-level" need not necessarily be confined to first-grade level when the instructional materials for those pupils are produced by the pupils themselves in The DOVACK System.

There is implied evidence that teachers need to spend much time with students encouraging them to expand their experiences, both real and vicarious, in order to help the students extend their vocabularies and develop their ability to express themselves orally.

(5) When pupils order and dictate their own instructional materials, they do not necessarily use the words that are on their grade level in the conventional trade books and text books. This needs further investigation by comparing the dictated words from the project populations with the most recent categorized word lists of published materials.

(B) Adoption of The DOVACK System

(1) It is necessary for the teachers and aides who will use The DOVACK System to participate in DOVACK workshops.

(2) Appropriate use of The DOVACK System should help overcome many of the problems in teaching standard English, initial and remedial reading; and in unifying the teaching of content with reading, language, and spelling.

(3) (May 1982) A specially programmed microcomputer now serves DOVACK. This enhances its adaptability, effectiveness, and economic feasibility. Plans are being made to offer an adoption package for DOVACK Demonstration, Adoption, Research, and Training Services (DARTS). See the next page, The DOVACK System.

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

The DOVACK System

What is DOVACK? DOVACK is a system for teaching beginners, nonreaders, and illiterates how to read in a natural language experience way, regardless of race, sex, age, dialect, cultural background, or previous history of failure. The goal of DOVACK is to overcome and prevent disabilities caused by failure to learn to read.

How is DOVACK different from other systems? DOVACK is a unique blend of creative, unified language experience teaching, sensory aids, and computer support. Students provide their own content by dictating orally about anything they can talk about. They use words and concepts they already know and understand. After the students learn the process of reading, they learn the mechanics of reading, spelling, and writing, each using his or her own material. With DOVACK composite stories for transition to published materials, they learn standard English for alternative situational use, still using their own words. (Many students need both nonstandard and standard English - one to be comfortable in communicating with family and peers, the other to survive in the marketplace.)

What does DOVACK mean? DOVACK is a descriptive acronym for Differentiated, Oral, Visual, Aural, Computerized, Kinesthetic. An experienced classroom teacher, Florine L. Way, originated, designed, and developed DOVACK to maintain the advantages and overcome the disadvantages of the time-honored Language Experience Approach (LEA). Students study independently with sensory aids to learn to recognize visually material they dictated orally with prior comprehension.

Computerized? Does the computer replace the teacher? No. The computer does the chores. The teacher, trained in DOVACK workshops, creates a productive learning environment in which he or she can teach, motivate, encourage, guide, and interact with the students. Only humans can do this effectively with beginners, nonreaders, and illiterates. (A teacher who has used the LEA successfully can relate to DOVACK immediately and start using it after a brief workshop.) The aide, trained in DOVACK workshops, transcribes the dictations and operates the computer in a separate room. The microcomputer, specially programmed for use with DOVACK, makes it possible for each lesson, test, and report to be individualized, customized, processed, and printed out in the DOVACK format according to each student's own self-pacing needs. This is more effective for DOVACK than the mainframes that used to serve it. Now there can be faster return for lessons, tests, and reports; the teacher can choose type size and different test/report times according to each student's needs.

Has DOVACK been field-tested? Yes. It was developed with illiterate prison inmates; field tested (ESEA Title III) with beginning readers and nonreaders in Jefferson County, Florida; selected by the American Institutes for Research as a MODEL PROGRAM IN CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (1970) and a MODEL PROGRAM IN READING (1971); used in New Hampshire with juvenile delinquents who cannot read (ESEA Title IV; Crime Commission).

When will DOVACK be available? Plans are being made for The DOVACK Corporation (non-profit) to offer an adoption package for DOVACK Demonstration, Adoption, Research, and Training Services (DARTS). This will include workshops, leased hardware/software, monitoring visits, and data collection. For more information, write to: Florine L. Way, P. O. Box 3140, Manchester, NH 03105.

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way (15)

DOVACK References

Chapman, Ruth, "Computer Does the Chores in DOVACK," Florida Schools, Vol. 32, No. 2 (p. 20-25), illus., November-December, 1969.

Conway, Patricia A., "Use of Computer Enhances Remedial Reading Technique," REALTIME (Patricia A. Conway, Ed.) Control Data Corporation, Vol. 8, No. 51 (p. 3), Minneapolis, 1972.

Directory of Scholars Active. Entry # E2 "The DOVACK Model" in Computers and the Humanities, Vol. 4, No. 5 (p. 323-324), May 1970.

"DOVACK Method for Teaching Reading," Projects to Advance Creativity in Education. Projects Funded in Florida Through June 30, 1968 (p. 4-8), Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, Floyd T. Christian, Commissioner. Tallahassee, 1968.

"The DOVACK Model," in "Florida Reading News - Notes and Quotes" (Edited by Kitty Mae Taylor), Florida Reading Quarterly, Vol. V1, No. 1 (p. 42-43), December 1969.

"The DOVACK System" (b&w 16 mm film 18 min), 1969, 1970.

Eagleton, Mr. (i.e. Senator Thomas Eagleton). "Potential for Educational Technology," Congressional Record - Senate, Vol. 117, No. 128 (p. S 13878 - S 13880), September 8, 1971. (Note: This entry includes remarks by Senator Eagleton about DOVACK and a reprint of the Wills article about DOVACK q.v. below.)

Information Retrieval System Index for Educational Practices and Programs, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The invited listing for DOVACK is entry #29-0373. Madison, 1970.

LIST 1972 (Library and Information Science Today, An International Registry of Research and Innovation) (Paul Wasserman, Managing Editor). The invited description of DOVACK is Entry # 949. New; York: Science Associates/ International, 1972.

MODEL PROGRAMS IN CHILDHOOD EDUCATION - DOVACK, Cat. No. 5.20:20141, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (17 pages, 20 c), 1970.

MODEL PROGRAMS IN READING - DOVACK, In the Foreword to each booklet (OE-20029-OE-30039), 1971, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402), DOVACK is listed with six other programs after the following comments,"Seven reading programs were included in the first MODEL PROGRAMS - CHILDHOOD EDUCATION series. Since these booklets had already been published, they were not duplicated for this series. However, so that the seven will not be 'lost' to those interested in exemplary reading programs, they are listed here by title and OE number ....." Washington, 1971.

Paisley, Clifton, "The One What Drinking Water Is The Sister ....." in Research in Review (Clifton Paisley, Ed.) Florida State University, Tallahassee, November, 1970.

Research and Development Register in Early Childhood Education, 1970. National Program on Early Childhood Education, CEMREL, Document # 04152 N-BA-B-23. St. Louis, Mo. 1970. March, 1971.

Copyright © 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way

Way, Florine L. Teaching Illiterate Prison Inmates with Individual Pupil Dictation Technique and Testing with Adaptation for Group Administration of Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test: An Evaluation (Report to the Warden and Bureau of Prisons of an evaluation pilot study at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida; 48 pages; unpublished, distributed). Tallahassee, 1965.

Way, Florine L. The DOVACK Method for Teaching Reading (24 pages, unpublished, distributed). Tallahassee, 1966.

Way, Florine L. "The DOVACK Model," Educom Bulletin, Vol. 4, No. 5 (p. 5-6), October, 1969.

Way, Florine L. "The 'Language Experience' Approach in Teaching Reading - Computerized," Computers and Automation, Vol. 19, No. 9 (p. 28-31), September 1970. Abstract in Language and Language Behavior Abstracts Vol. V, No. 1 (Entry E00251, p. 530-531). January, 1971.

Way, Florine L. DOVACK: METHOD FOR TEACHING READING. July 1, 1968 - August 31, 1971. Project Report to ESEA Title III. ERIC ED 071 268, 1973.

Way, Flo. The DOVACK System (16 pages. Brochure prepared for ED/fair '72, printing cost paid by USOE.) Tallahassee 1972.

Way, Florine L., "The DOVACK System for Individualized Language Experience Reading Instruction." Abstract in Final Program for International Conference on Computers in the Humanities, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, July 20-22, 1973.

Wills, Martee. "DOVACK's Machines Help Children Read," American Education, Vol. 7, No. 5 (p. 3-8), illus. June, 1971. Reprinted in Congressional Record - Senate, Vol. 117, No. 128 (p. S 13878 - S 13880), September 8, 1971, at the request of Senator Eagleton following his remarks, "Potential of Educational Technology," (qv above).

Copyright c 1972, 1982 by Florine L. Way